

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

LEUPOLD & STEVENS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. 3:14-cv-00727-AC

v.

ORDER

U.S. OPTICS, INC.,

Defendant.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Acosta issued a Findings and Recommendation [22] on April 8, 2015, in which he recommends that this Court grant Defendant U.S. Optics Inc.'s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

Because neither party timely filed an objection to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, I am relieved of my obligation to review the record *de novo*. United States v.


Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc); see also United States v. Bernhardt, 840 F.2d 1441, 1444 (9th Cir. 1988) (*de novo* review required only for portions of Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been made). Having reviewed the legal principles *de novo*, I find no error.

#### CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Acosta's Findings & Recommendation [22]. Accordingly, U.S. Optics, Inc.'s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction is granted, and this case is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4 day of June, 2015.

  
MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ  
United States District Judge